

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER

3-06-70306 EDL

Page 1 of 2

1	KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) United States Attorney
2	MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549) Chief, Criminal Division
4 5	NAHLA RAJAN (CSBN 218838) Special Assistant United States Attorney
6 7 8	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-6838 FAX: (415) 436-7234 Email: nahla.rajan@usdoj.gov RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. 3-06-70306 EDL
14	Plaintiff,)) {PROPOSED} ORDER AND
15	v.) STIPULATION EXTENDING TIME UNDER RULE 5.1 AND EXCLUDING
16	ANTONIO MELENDEZ-TORRES, aka Antonio Torres Melendez, TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
17 18	Defendant.
19	The parties stipulate and agree, and the Court finds and holds, as follows:
20	1. The parties appeared on the instant matter May 18, 2006 in front of the Honorable
21	Elizabeth D. Laporte for defendant's initial appearance on the complaint. On May 18, 2006, the
22	matter was continued to June 6, 2006 for a detention hearing and to set an arraignment /
23	preliminary hearing. On June 6, 2006, the parties appeared in front of the Honorable Maria-
24	Elena James, and the matter was continued to June 16, 2006 for detention hearing and to set an
25	arraignment / preliminary hearing. On June 16, 2006, the matter was again continued to June 26,
26	2006 for detention hearing and to set an arraignment / preliminary hearing.
27	2. On June 16, 2006, Assistant Public Defender Steven G. Kalar, who represents the
28	defendant, requested an exclusion of time from June 16, 2006 to June 26, 2006, based on

Case 3:06-mj-70306-MRGD Document 10 Filed 06/19/06 Page 2 of 2

Case 3:06-mj-70306-MAG Document 7 Filed 06/16/2006 Page 2 of 2

effective preparation and continuity of counsel. The defendant agreed to an extension of time for the preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1(d) and an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties are involved in discussions which appear likely to lead to pre-indictment resolution of this case. Therefore, the parties are requesting an extension of time under Rule 5.1(d) and an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties agree that the time from June 16, 2006 to June 26, 2006 should be extended under Rule 5.1(d) and excluded in computing the time within which an information or indictment must be filed. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

3. In light of the foregoing facts, the failure to grant the requested exclusion would

- 3. In light of the foregoing facts, the failure to grant the requested exclusion would unreasonably deny counsel for the defense the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See id. The ends of justice would be served by the Court excluding the proposed time period. These ends outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See id. § 3161(h)(8)(A).
- 4. For the reasons stated, the time period from June 16, 2006 to June 26, 2006 is extended under Rule 5.1(d) and excluded from the calculation of time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: _____ Respectfully Submitted,

| /S/ | NAHLA RAJAN |
| Special Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: _______ /S/
STEVEN G. KALAR
Counsel for Antonio Melendez-Torres

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 6/19/06
HONORABLE MARIA-ELEN

United States Magistrate Judge

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER 3-06-70306 EDL

. , 3